

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/535,591	05/19/2005	Jan-Willem Van De Waerdt	US02 0465 US	7635	
65913 NXP, B, V,	7590 03/01/20	11	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELL	ECTUAL PROPERTY	CYGIEL, GARY W			
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, C		2187			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/01/2011	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/535,591		VAN DE WAERDT ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Gary W. Cygiel	2187		

	Gary W. Cygiel	2187						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 17 February 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS.	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.						
<ol> <li>All The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one or the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavition eal (with appeal fee) in compliance CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed to the complex of the compl	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	vhich places the r (3) a Request					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1		00/->						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as					
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the second process.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS	,							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because     (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);     (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying to	he issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanent (	101-324).					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an expla how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is of will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 3/30(f1).								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
<del>-</del> —								
/Kevin L Ellis/	/G. W. C./							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2187	Examiner, Art Unit 2187							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant appears to present arguments which are similar to the arguments presented in the response dated 23 November 2010. Since there appears to be no new arguments regarding the rejections, the examiner asserts that the current arguments have been adequately responded to in the final office action dated 17 December 2010.